

## **REMARKS**

The applicants acknowledge, with thanks, receipt of the office action dated March 13, 2006, and completion of the personal interview of May 31, 2006. The discussions therein, along with the Examiner's much appreciated observations and suggestions, are summarized and incorporated herein.

The Examiner objected to the title of the invention. The Applicants have amended the title accordingly.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-32 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as to the use of the term "adapted for." The Applicants have amended the claims to delete the "adapted for" language.

Claims 1-4, 9-20, and 23-were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,782,387 to Kumashio in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,553,368 to Martin. Claims 5-8 and 21-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumashio and Martin in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,571,245 to Huang. In view of the forgoing comments, and the reasons set forth below, it is submitted that all claims, as clarified with subject amendments, are patentably distinct over the art of record in in condition for allowance thereover.

By way of review, the subject application teaches a system that functions to integrate, largely seamlessly to a user's perspective, operation of an external document management system with a user interface associated with local file navigation system, such as one would be accustomed to by working in a Windows environment. This is accomplished even though the external document management system is accomplished via a browser-based interface. In a preferred embodiment, the system functions by interaction with an operating system registry so as to allow the external document management system to be represented by a folder on the operating system's native interface. Such operation may be restricted relative to specified access rights. With such operation, the system facilitates handling of document metadata associated with electronic documents managed by the document managements system. Such metadata is preserved and transferred during operations that occur within the purview of the document management system. Movement of documents from the external document management system to externally to the system, the metadata need not be transferred. The claims have been amended to clarify such features.

None of the references cited disclose a system and method wherein a document processor interface is integrated into an operating system environment, and wherein metadata associated with the document processing operation is retained for operations associated with the document processor, and removed for operations communicated elsewhere. As noted in the interview, such a limitation is not found within the art of record.

For this reason, all claims are patentably distinct over the art of record and in condition for allowance thereover.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all instant application patentably distinct over the art of record and in condition for allowance thereof. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes there are any further matters, which need to be discussed in order to expedite the prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

If there are any fees necessitated by the foregoing communication, please charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0902, referencing our Docket No. 66329/14869.

Respectfully submitted,  
TUCKER ELLIS & WEST LLP



---

Susan L. Mizer  
Reg. No. 38,245  
1150 Huntington Bldg.  
925 Euclid Avenue  
Cleveland, Ohio 44115-1475  
Customer No.: 23380  
Tel.: (216) 696-3466  
Fax: (216) 592-5009

Date: June 8, 2006